

L LOCKS LAW FIRM
PLLC

110 East 55th Street
New York, New York 10022
T 212.838.3333
T 866.LOCKSLAW
F 212.838.3735
lockslaw.com

USDC SDNY
DOCUMENT
ELECTRONICALLY FILED
DOC #:
DATE FILED: 5/9/08

VIA FACSIMILE (212) 805-7942

Hon. Alvin K. Hellerstein
United States District Court
Southern District of New York
United States Courthouse
500 Pearl Street, Room 1050
New York, New York 10007

Re: *Millan v. Citigroup, Inc.*
07 cv 3769 (AKH)

Dear Judge Hellerstein:

This firm represents the Plaintiff, Carmelo Millan, in the above-referenced matter. We write to request an adjournment of the date set for Oral Argument on Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment, which is currently scheduled for Wednesday, May 14, 2008. We are respectfully requesting this adjournment because of an unresolved dispute concerning one of the documents Plaintiff submitted in opposition to Defendants' motion, namely the Declaration of Mr. Garza, Plaintiff's expert, and in light of the Defendants' recently filed "Reply" Memorandum in Support of their already resolved Motion to Strike the Mr. Garza's declaration.

As will be more fully discussed in a joint letter to be shortly submitted by the parties, Plaintiff filed an amended declaration of her expert, Mr. Garza, thereby complying with this Court's Order dated April 8, 2008, which disposed of Defendants' motion to strike by conditionally granting it unless Plaintiff submitted such a revised declaration. Plaintiff's timely submission thus resolved that motion, and had Defendants' any further issues with Mr. Garza's amended declaration, they should have filed a new motion to strike the amended declaration. Plaintiff, of course, would then have had an opportunity to respond to the new motion (an opportunity Plaintiff has not had with request to Defendants' original motion to strike). Because the Declaration of Mr. Garza is a relevant and very important part of Plaintiff's Opposition to Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment, we are requesting an adjournment of oral argument of the underlying summary judgment motion pending resolution of this issue.

May 9, 2008

*The motion will proceed
as scheduled. All requested
issues can be presented for
resolution at the time.
5-9-08*

Alvin K. Hellerstein


Hon. Alvin K. Hellerstein
May 9, 2008
Page 2

We have consulted with defense counsel regarding this matter and they do not consent to an adjournment because they do not want any delays in the oral argument of the summary judgment motion.

No previous requests for an adjournment have been made.

Thank you for your attention and consideration to this matter.

Respectfully submitted,



Janet Walsh (JW-8658)

cc: Sarah Bouchard, Esq. (Via Facsimile)
Sarah Pontoski, Esq. (Via Facsimile)